

**A. Call to Order**

- John Boynton will chair the meeting for Mary Storrs.
- *Present:* Kathleen Ogden Fasser, Kay Upham, Hannah Yelle, Ravin Nanda, Brian Miller, Zander Kessler, Ryan Kane, Robert Grom, Laurie Hunter, John Boynton, John Flaherty, Mike Mastrullo, Brian Schlegel, Mary McCabe
  - *Absent:* Mary Storrs, Barry Haley, Susan Blevins
- Follow-up procedural question from previous meeting: Has everyone been sworn in?
  - John Boynton and Kathleen Ogden Fasser will go to Town Hall this week

**B. Public Comments (4 residents present)**

- John Boynton asked if there were any public comments
  - Brian Crouse introduced himself and offered to assist if needed
    - See the letter he submitted for details

**C. Reading of Minutes**

- John Boynton suggested some edits to the November 7 Minutes
  - Edits approved; Revised document was forwarded to Mary Storrs
- John Boynton suggested some edits to the November 21 Minutes
  - Edits approved; Revised document was forwarded to Mary Storrs

**D. Communication and Correspondence**

- Mary Storrs as the chairperson should receive all correspondence
- Mary Storrs will forward correspondence to committee members
- The committee agreed that it was premature/not necessary to review all of the correspondence at this time.
  - John Boynton noted that the correspondence contains some substantive ideas and he encouraged committee members to read the letters in preparation for future discussions
- A discussion followed re whether correspondence could be made public without prior approval from the author

**E. Reports and Issues for Discussion**

- *Feedback from site walk*
  - Several committee members and residents walked the site as scheduled at 3:30 p.m.
  - During the site walk a discussion ensued about alternative parking solutions
  - Several members of the committee thought the area directly in front of the Beede Center, i.e., on the school side of the road, might present an opportunity for additional parking spaces
    - i. Mike Mastrullo thought it might be possible to capture some space between the road and the drainage basin
    - ii. John Flaherty asked what the impact might be if the road was widened, i.e., permeable/impermeable surface area issue
    - iii. Brian Miller thought it might be possible to carve out 100 spots on the diagonal between the road and the trees
    - iv. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked if there might be a restriction re the size of the drainage basin and surrounding land

- v. John Flaherty noted that we could not change the overall drainage capacity
- vi. Kay Upham asked about alternatives to the drainage basin, i.e., a tank
- vii. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked if the design could be changed
- viii. Mike Mastrullo emphasized that his focus was on the area that appeared to be dead space, i.e., not a wholesale change in the drainage area
- ix. Brian Miller noted this might be an opportunity to connect more directly the Beede Center to the high school, e.g., a boardwalk
- x. Everyone agreed that the site walk was helpful

- *Updated Site Plan*

- Kathleen Ogden Fasser provided an update re efforts to obtain CAD files of the site plan
- Some progress has been made. Kathleen is still missing some of the necessary files, i.e., Landfill documents and Gale documents are still needed; John Boynton will follow-up on the Gale documents; Brian Schlegel will follow-up on the Landfill documents
- Kathleen Ogden Fasser confirmed that the wetlands are flagged on the documents that the committee now has; Kathleen noted that it would be helpful if the committee had information re the setbacks for the train, Route 2, etc.; According to Kathleen, setbacks would provide reference/background information so that the committee could really understand the space; Kathleen is also seeking information regarding the aquifer; Kathleen would like to layer ALL of the information on one document; Kathleen would like to have a final CAD plan available for the committee before the January 9 meeting so that the committee members could assess the document as a together
- Kathleen Ogden Fasser noted that during the walk she and others learned briefly how the land is used, for e.g., the sledding hill; it would be helpful if that type of information could be added to the site plan when it becomes available
  - i. John Flaherty agreed to get additional details re the skateboard park
  - ii. Brian Schlegel agreed to get the setback information
  - iii. Brian will also pursue the landfill CAD documents
  - iv. John Boynton will also email Gale
- A discussion ensued whether the skateboard park is still used; Hannah Yelle used the skateboard when she was in middle school
- Brian Miller asked if the skateboard park pieces are mobile, i.e., can the park be moved; Brian Schlegel noted that the park has some permanent features; Mike Mastrullo asked whether the park is still popular with high school students? [Abutting resident] \_\_\_\_ Cancio interjected that the park was used more in the summer months ("a few kids") but that it was not used as much as it had been since the old school was replaced; According to Ms. Cancio there are some regulars who use the park, but not often; maybe the improvements to the grounds changed the usage; John Boynton added that maybe we need to market it different; John Flaherty noted that multiple town funding sources contributed to the development of the park; Kathleen Ogden Fasser reminded the committee that the pavement is considered part of the cap

- *CDW Notice of Activity and Use Limitation*

- John Flaherty offered a summary of the CDW draft AUL: if a proposal/project requires penetration of the cap, the proposal/project needs to include a plan for remediation; in short, no project can penetrate the surface beyond 22 inches
- Bob Grom confirmed that the AUL is a draft only
  - i. Bob Grom asked whether the AUL would allow for a 6 or 8 lane track; Several committee members noted that the committee would need to know more about the drainage requirements; Several committee members agreed that the AUL did not prohibit “building up” and “building up” might include the drainage
  - ii. Bob Grom asked for further clarification around the AUL, in other words, the committee does not want to pass the AUL along if it would later prohibit use; Bob Grom asked if the language needs to be further refined to prevent exclusion of certain projects
  - iii. Kathleen Ogden Fasser reminded the committee that the language was designed to protect the cap
- Kathleen Ogden Fasser thought Kathy (from CDW) had confirmed that certain activity would be permitted, including a berm; John Flaherty thought any future changes to the language should go through Mary Storrs who could then contact CDW; Any/All timely input is welcomed; Bob Grom noted that we might be able to have Kathy (CDW) meet with the committee a second time to discuss the AUL language; Brian Miller suggested that it would be better to add language that spoke to elevation, i.e., some baseline number if you add additional materials you are within the AUL
- *List of Stakeholders*
  - The committee looked at a draft list of stakeholders and asked for feedback re whether any known stakeholders were missing from the list
  - Zander Kessler mentioned the the youth track program run through the Concord Recreation; is that a separate category (Zander mentioned Dave Bell as the contact person)
  - Ravin Nanda asked whether the property was open to the public during the school day; John Flaherty confirmed that this is not the case
  - Kathleen Ogden Fasser sought clarification about the list, i.e., whether the list included Susan Blevin’s first draft; Bob Grom said yes
    - i. Bob Grom asked about the difference between camps and clinics and whether additional clinic stakeholders should be added to the list; Ryan Kane explained the difference
    - ii. A discussion followed about whether camps should be listed and specifically who we would contact; John Flaherty thought it would be a good idea to disaggregate camps from clinics
    - iii. Mary McCabe asked if we should add the middle school track program as a stakeholder
- *Public Engagement Plan*
  - i. Brian Miller, Kay Upham, Kathleen Ogden Fasser, and Mary Storrs, and Bob Grom met separately to discuss and draft a Public Engagement Plan
  - ii. Kathleen Ogden Fasser introduced the proposed Public Engagement Plan; Kathleen explained:

1. The plan includes a rubric
2. The committee needs to understand our goals and the public needs to understand the goals as well
3. The rubric includes an engagement goal, i.e., what role the stakeholders will have
  - a. The committee wants to keep stakeholders informed
  - b. The committee wants to consult with and collaborate with the stakeholders
  - c. The committee wants to hear their perspectives, listen; seek active input, which will be reflected in our decision making; Kathleen noted that this was different than the role of the stakeholder/public as a partner who votes; instead we are actively collaborating; the committee seeks authentic engagement
  - d. Who are the stakeholders? The list was updated at the meeting and will continue to be updated
  - e. Continuing with the rubric, Kathleen noted that we have established a location and a place for the public meeting, i.e., "Outreach Strategies and Methods"
  - f. Brian Miller asked about E-mail blasts, i.e., targeted email for specific group leaders; request input and information from them; Laurie Hunter can arrange E-mail blasts
  - g. Kathy Ogden Fasser commented that under outreach strategies and methods she did not envision students filling out a survey/form; both Kathy and Brian Miller said that in addition to the public meeting we would need to some student forums
  - h. The site walk was part of outreach strategies and methods
  - i. The purpose of the public input meeting(s) is to present our charge and our understanding of the condition of the campus; and the existing uses and user groups; the plan would be to summarize any proposals we have received; and seek public input; verbal opportunity
    - i. This will take place in late January (and possibly a later date as well)
  - j. A discussion ensued about the RFI. Talked about a RFI; the subcommittee thought the RFI should be a little more casual, hence ideas, not a formal RFI; don't want voices stifled because of a more formal/daunting process; the RFI would be based on the evaluation rubric; the RFI takes the rubric and turns each standard into questions
    - i. This allows for a consistent format
    - ii. The last page of the Public Engagement Plan outlines a preliminary schedule

- iii. Mike Mastrullo, Laurie Hunter, and others thanked the sub-committee for their work and Kathleen Ogden Fasser for her presentation
- k. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked when is it reasonable to ask for RFI's
  - i. Mike Mastrullo suggested a date after the second public input?
  - ii. John Boynton proposed one month after the initial meeting
  - iii. Laurie Hunter reminded everyone that we were aiming for the May 22 school committee meeting and it is helpful to schedule back from there
  - iv. John Flaherty thinks the committee's goal of May 22 makes sense; any project/proposal will want to have a feasibility report done before the November warrant article deadline
  - v. Kay Upham thought a month after the meeting was VERY reasonable; and, we could remain flexible;
  - vi. John Boynton suggested we add a February 26 deadline into the schedule
  - vii. Kathleen Ogden Fasser reminded the committee that this was a "living document;" and any/all changes should include revision numbers

- 
- 4. John Boynton noted that at an earlier meeting we discussed a survey
    - a. Do we want a survey for the community?
    - b. Should we wait for the RFI's?
    - c. Several members of the committee thought we should wait until after the February 26 deadline before creating a survey
    - d. John Boynton noted that we will have some folks who don't fill out a RFI - we want to hear from them as well, for e.g., students, for e.g., the Weeds Club - will they fill out an RFI? Some committee members were concerned that students might not bother
    - e. Similarly, Zander Kessler suggested that we might want the private schools in the area to participate
  - 5. John Boynton asked about the best means of contacting the stakeholders; he asked whether the stakeholders could be part of any / all E-mail "blasts"; stakeholders include the general public; it is important that we get contact info for the stakeholders;
  - 6. John Boynton suggested writing a letter to the Concord Journal, i.e., explaining the process; Hannah Yelle mentioned the Carlisle Mosquito

7. John Boynton suggested a letter or possibly a commentary (a little longer) (purpose is usually community awareness) (committee's charge seems to meet this standard)
8. Kathleen Ogden Fasser mentioned that we should place fact sheets in public spaces
9. John Boynton suggested we Invite the Concord Journal to the January public meeting
10. Brian Miller asked everyone on the committee to add any known contact info to the stakeholder list;
11. A discussion ensued re whether we want to own an email list
12. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked about our strategy for the January 24 input meeting;
  - a. It was suggested that a few committee members attend and ...
    - i. Present our charge
    - ii. Present our understanding of the site
    - iii. Present the known uses and the user groups
    - iv. Present the process for input, i.e., RFI's, survey, forums, etc.
  - b. Mike Mastrullo noted that the strategy for the January 24 meeting is probably an agenda item for the committee's next meeting
  - c. John Boynton commented that we have most of what we need for the January 24 meeting
  - d. Mike Mastrullo asked if the committee might start publicizing the January 24 meeting now
    - i. Laurie Hunter agreed to send out an E-mail blast now and then again after the holidays
  - e. John Boynton suggested a targeted campaign in the newspaper
    - i. Mike Mastrullo agreed to draft a commentary; the parameters of the commentary suggested by John Boynton; The commentary is an "awareness" generator; Not just about the landfill or parking; 500 words
  - f. John Boynton reminded the committee that Envision Concord has facebook page, a twitter account, etc., but it is still difficult to get people to attend meetings
    - i. So the goal is to make at least every shareholder aware
    - ii. 80% - 20% rule
  - g. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked who the current blast was going out to? -
    - i. Laurie - going out to all of the families K-12 in Concord
  - h. John Flaherty noted that at the January 9 meeting we should finalize the RFI and any materials need for the January 24 meeting

- i. Kathleen added we will need any/all comments/edits to the Public Engagement Plan and she would prepare a short powerpoint
    - ii. Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked that all committee members take a look at the rubric before the next meeting; committee members should also look at the draft RFI
    - iii. Committee members should look at the rubric and respond directly to Kathleen with comments
    - iv. Kathleen liked John Flaherty's idea of including an abstract as an introduction
  - i. Ryan Kane noted that the town has a public information officer; we could ask them to put an announcement on their website (contact Erin Stevens)
  - j. The draft public engagement doc is on the google drive; Kathleen Ogden Fasswer will upload the word version so that Mike Mastrullo can make edits; then when the edits are done; we need to create a pfd
- 13. John Boynton made a proposal about the next meeting
  - a. Review the final RFI (everyone submit ideas on the draft)
  - b. Finalize communication materials associated with the January 24 meeting
  - c. Finalize any PR type blurbs
  - d. Finalize the stakeholder list w/ email contact
  - e. Collect feedback re any powerpoint slides needed
    - i. We are best off framing the objective in a manner that limits the proposals that are "totally out there ideas"; in other words, clearly emphasize the key restrictions
  - f. Collect any feedback re the AUL

#### **F. Miscellaneous**

- John Flaherty thought we should post the names of the committee members on the website
- John Boynton reminded the committee that we would save any/all correspondence for a later meeting; committee members should read; discuss the letters as a set; possibly discuss letters when the RFI's are submitted?
- Zander - save the letters for the next meeting; stay current on them; maybe discuss the letters as a set;

#### **G. Public Comment**

- Cynthia Rainey asked if the committee could post the communication we receive
  - The committee needs Mary Storrs' input re this request
  - Laurie Hunter expressed concerned that the public might not understand that the letters are public; the committee needs input from Mary Storrs
  - John Boynton agreed that the committee needs to formalize its policy on this issue before the next meeting
  - Laurie Hunter noted that the School Committee does not post every letter it receives

- School Committee letters are referenced in the correspondence section of the minutes but not published
- Cynthia Rainey added that if we are deliberating then the letters should be published; but the committee has not deliberated yet
- Brian Crouse
  - Requested access to the stakeholder list as he thought he might be able to help with the contact info
  - Brian Crouse also agreed that consolidating challenges/limitations of the site will filter out ideas that are simply unrealistic
- Julie-Ann Cancio (abutter)
  - Asked if she might be added to the stakeholder list; primary concern is assuring that she as an abutter and her neighbors receive any/all updates
  - John Boynton noted that nothing would be going out until after the January 9 meeting
  - John Boynton suggested that Ms. Cancio contact Mary Storrs if she wants to be placed on a list

**H. Adjourned at 6:28**